



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/630,162

07/30/2003

Irena Hudis

13768.429

7646

47973 7590 01/15/2008
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/630,162

Applicant(s)

HUDIS ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Popham

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-32 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-32 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20070809
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Remarks

Claims 24-32 and 34 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/16/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 24, 25, 27-32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett (U.S. Patent 6,772,157) in view of Maier (U.S. Patent 5,625,815).

Regarding Claim 24,

Barnett discloses in a computer system that includes items stored in at least one volume being divided into at least one security zone, each

of the at least one security zone being defined as a grouping of items having common security rules, each item residing in a security zone from among the at least one security zone, each security zone having one or more principals with administrative rights, a method of delegating administrative rights to other principals for first items included in a main security zone included in the at least one security zone, comprising:

An act of identifying first items and other items residing in a main security zone within a volume comprising a plurality of security zones (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34);

An act of splitting the main security zone into a first security zone and a remaining main security zone, the one or more main principals retaining administrative rights for the first security zone and the remaining main security zone, the first security zone including the first items and the remaining main security zone including only the other items from the main security zone not included in the first items (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34), and

An act of specifying that one or more first principals also have administrative rights to the first security zone containing the first items (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34);

But may not explicitly disclose that the zones are non-overlapping.

Maier, however, discloses that the first non-overlapping security zone and the remaining non-overlapping main security zone do not

overlap with any of the plurality of other non-overlapping security zones included in the volume, and that the splitting is restricted in such a way as to prevent overlapping between security zones and such that none of the first items and other items from the main non-overlapping security zone are shared when the main non-overlapping security zone is split wherein the security zones thereby have a dynamic configurable granularity of items having common security rules (Abstract; Column 2, lines 24-33; Column 5, line 62 to Column 6, line 18; and Column 9, line 12 to Column 10, line 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the partition restructuring system of Maier into the delegated administration system of Barnett in order to allow the system to restructure and reconfigure the splits or partitions of a data storage system (e.g. database) in an efficient manner whenever the need arises, thereby allowing the system to dynamically change how and where data is stored and managed.

Regarding Claim 34,

Claim 34 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 24 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 25,

Barnett as modified by Maier discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses that specifying the one or more first principals is performed by the one or more main principals (Column 6, lines 13-52).

Regarding Claim 27,

Barnett as modified by Maier discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses the administrative rights being security rights (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34).

Regarding Claim 28,

Barnett as modified by Maier discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses the administrative rights being auditing rights (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34).

Regarding Claim 29,

Barnett as modified by Maier discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses specifying security rules for the first security zone after the act of splitting (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34); and Maier discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Abstract; Column 2, lines 24-33; Column 5, line 62 to Column 6, line 18; and Column 9, line 12 to Column 10, line 67).

Regarding Claim 30,

Barnett as modified by Maier discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses specifying security rules for the first security zone by defaulting the security rules that were from the main security zone prior to the act of splitting (Column 5, line 35 to Column 6, line 65); and Maier discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Abstract; Column 2,

lines 24-33; Column 5, line 62 to Column 6, line 18; and Column 9, line 12 to Column 10, line 67).

Regarding Claim 31,

Barnett as modified by Maier discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses recombining the first security zone and the remaining main security zone (Column 6, lines 53-65; and Column 12, line 45 to Column 13, line 8); and Maier discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Abstract; Column 2, lines 24-33; Column 5, line 62 to Column 6, line 18; and Column 9, line 12 to Column 10, line 67).

Regarding Claim 32,

Barnett as modified by Maier discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses a subsequent remaining main security zone, the subsequent remaining main security zone formed from splitting the remaining main security zone, wherein the administrative principals of the subsequent remaining main security zone are the administrative principals in the main security zone, comprising an act of recombining the first security zone and the subsequent remaining main security zone (Column 6, lines 53-65; and Column 12, line 45 to Column 13, line 8); and Maier discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Abstract; Column 2, lines 24-33; Column 5, line 62 to Column 6, line 18; and Column 9, line 12 to Column 10, line 67).

Art Unit: 2137

3. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett in view of Maier, further in view of Anglin (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0199521).

Barnett as modified by Maier may not explicitly disclose labeling the first items with a zone enumeration corresponding to the first zone.

Anglin, however discloses labeling the first items with a security zone enumeration corresponding to the first non-overlapping security zone (Paragraphs 19, 24, and 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the group management system of Anglin into the delegated administration system of Barnett as modified by Maier in order to explicitly associate items with their appropriate zone, as well as to associate a zone entry with all of the items that belong to that zone, thereby increasing ease of viewing, management, and use of the system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2137

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner
Art Unit 2137


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER